

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 8 are amended and claims 8-23 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. These amendments are supported by the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0010] and [0082]. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under U.S.C 35 §102(b) over Shirasaki et al. (JP 2001-353454) and claim 1 over Goldowsky (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,512). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Shirasaki discloses all the limitations of claims 1 and 2. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Shirasaki does not disclose "reducing the content ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions," as recited in independent claims 1 and 2. Shirasaki discloses volatilization of solvent from particles paragraph [0035]. However, Shirasaki teaches away from volatilization of solvent from particles because "if a solvent volatilizes from a particle, a particle is not liquefied, it becomes powder, and will adhere to 11s of selection electrodes, and it becomes difficult to form the thin film of the continuous organic electroluminescence ingredient." Further, Shirasaki does not disclose anything about solvent ions only particles that consist of a solution of an organic electroluminescence ingredient. Thus, Shirasaki does not disclose the ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions. Accordingly, Shirasaki does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2.

Goldowsky discloses a hydrodynamic filter for removing large droplets (C4/L65-C5/L5) and a droplet ionization zone 15. However, there are no filters between the ionization zone 15 and the electrodes 29, 30 and 31 on the glass substrate 28 and Goldowsky discloses no solvent ions. Thus, Goldowsky does not disclose "reducing the content ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions," as recited in independent claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, Goldowsky does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2.

In view of the above, Shirasaki and Goldowsky do not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully solicited.

Further, claims 3-7 depend from claim 2. Thus, at least for their dependence on claim 2, as well as for the further features recited therein, claims 3-7 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 - 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) over Shirasaki in view of Hiroki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6696105); and claims 1-7 over Shirasaki in view of Ratner et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0157269) further in view of Guevremont et al (U.S. Patent No. 6639212). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above Shirasaki and Goldowsky do not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2.

Hiroki does not disclose the deficiencies of Shirasaki, as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2. Specifically, Hiroki discloses an ion extracting electrode, an ion acceleration and an ion control electrode (C4/L50-61). However, Hiroki does not disclose any solvent ions or any filter elements to change the ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions, as recited in claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, Shirasaki in view of Hiroki does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2. Thus, at least for its dependence on claim 2, as well as for the further features recited therein, claim 3 is allowable.

Ratner discloses ion focus and guiding elements 320 and 340, paragraph [0025], and the use of drying gas to reduce the amount of solvent contained in the spray mixture paragraph [0021]. However, Ratner does not disclose solvent ions or "reducing the content ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions," as recited in independent claims 1 and 2.

Guevremont discloses an ion filter for separating ions having the same mass to charge ratio but different ion mobility characteristics. Guevremont discloses that that a FAIMS-E device may not function properly when exposed to high levels of solvent vapour. Further,

Guevremont discloses the effect of solvent on the denaturing of bovine ubiquitin C21/L16-39. However, Guevremont does not disclose any solvent ions or "reducing the content ratio of solvent ions to pseudo-molecular ions, " as recited in independent claims 1 and 2.

Accordingly, Shirasaki in view of Ratner and Guevremont does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 2. Thus, claims 1 and 2 are allowable. Furthermore, at least for their dependence on claim 2, as well as for the further features recited therein, claims 3-7 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:MIL/hms

Date: March 13, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--